



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE ISSUED: January 16, 2004 REPORT NO. PC-04-010

ATTENTION: Planning Commission
Agenda of January 29, 2004

SUBJECT: Pilot Village Selection

REFERENCE: Manager's Report No. 03-204; General Plan Work Program Status;
Manager's Report No. 03-214; Pilot Village Program Incentives, Planning
Commission Report No. P-03-260; Pilot Village Program Incentives

APPLICANT/
OWNER The applicant team is listed in the description of each Pilot Village
applicant in the Discussion section of this report.

SUMMARY:

Issue – Of the seven Pilot Village applications submitted, which merit forwarding to the City Council for selection as Pilot Villages based upon meeting the goals and evaluation criteria of the Pilot Village Program?

Manager's Recommendation – **RECOMMEND** that the City Council select the following four applications as the initial Pilot Villages in alphabetical order:

The Boulevard Marketplace-MCTIP (Mid-City – Normal Heights)
Mi Pueblo (San Ysidro)
The Paseo (College Area)
Village Center at Euclid and Market (Southeastern San Diego - Encanto)

Those **not recommended** for selection as Pilot Villages in this initial phase of Pilot Villages are:

The Edge! (Mira Mesa)
Morena Vista (Linda Vista)
North Park Pilot Village (North Park)

An analysis of each proposed Pilot Village is included in the Discussion section of this report. Significant components of each application are included as Attachment 1 of this report. A comparison of the proposal is provided in a matrix (Attachment 2).

Community Planning Group Recommendation – On February 4, 2003 the Normal Heights Community Planning Committee voted 10-0-1 to support **The Boulevard Marketplace** (Mid-City Transit Interchanges project) pilot village application. They also recommended the development of an infrastructure plan to support the pilot village.

On January 20, 2003, the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group was expected to vote on a recommendation regarding **The Edge!** Pilot Village application. The vote will be reported as part of the staff presentation at the January 29 Planning Commission hearing. Previously, the group voted to support the initiation of a community plan amendment associated with The Edge! The group supported the initiation to allow for the study and analysis of a list of issues, prepared by their committee, regarding the collocation of residential and employment use.

On February 18, 2003, the San Ysidro Community Planning and Development Group expressed the consensus of the members of the planning board by fully endorsing the **Mi Pueblo** Pilot Village application (this reaffirmed a unanimous vote on June 19, 2001 to support and endorse the selection of San Ysidro as one of the first pilots for the City of Villages concept). The planning board is expected to take a formal vote on the application on January 20, 2004. Staff will report the board's vote at the Planning Commission hearing.

On February 24, 2003, the Linda Vista Community Planning Group voted unanimously (19-0) to support the **Morena Vista** Pilot Village application.

On February 18, 2003, the Greater North Park Planning Committee (GNPPC) voted 12-1-1 to support the **North Park** Pilot Village application submittal and recommended the inclusion of the entire University Avenue corridor. On October 21, 2003, the GNPPC voted 10-3-0 to support the Phase II North Park Pilot Village application.

On April 1, 2003, the College Area Community Council voted 11-3-0 to endorse **The Paseo** Pilot Village application.

On February 18, 2003, the Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group voted 6-0-2 to support the **Village Center at Euclid and Market** as a Pilot Village.

Other Recommendations – See Attachment 3, Letters of Support. All letters are available to review in the Planning Department on the fifth floor of the City Administration Building, 202 "C" Street.

Environmental Impact – This activity is exempt per CEQA Section 15060 (c)(3) because it is not a project as defined in Section 15378. After a Planning Commission recommendation, City Council will select the Pilot Villages. Entitlement to build can occur only with subsequent discretionary approvals of site development permits (and in four of the proposals, community plan amendments/rezones) and site specific environmental review in accordance with CEQA based upon a detailed project design. The one exception is Morena Vista which received all necessary discretionary approvals and environmental review, as approved by the City Council on November 3, 2003.

Fiscal Impact – None with this action. Future actions may include the granting of financial incentives per the Pilot Village Incentive Program, adopted November 17, 20003.

Code Enforcement Impact – None with this action.

Housing Affordability Impact – None with this action, however, it is a goal of the Pilot Village Program that all of the proposals designate 20 percent or more of the total housing as affordable as defined by the Housing Commission. More detail about how each of the proposals intend to meet this goal is included in the Discussion section.

BACKGROUND

Pilot Village Program Overview and Goals

“Create neighborhoods we can be proud of”

On January 8, 2001, the Mayor issued this challenge to all of us. On October 22, 2002, the City Council adopted the Strategic Framework Element and the City of Villages strategy as an amendment to the Progress Guide and General Plan to begin to meet the challenge. Citing the critical need for implementation, the City Council also adopted the Action Plan, and as part of that call to action, established the Pilot Village Program. Neighborhood enhancement is at the core of the Strategic Framework Element, a comprehensive strategy for each community to consciously determine where and how growth should occur, and to address the issues associated with that growth. The City of Villages strategy focuses reinvestment, and when appropriate, growth, into “villages. A village is a place in the community where housing, jobs, schools, public facilities and services are brought together. Villages are walkable and include inviting public and civic spaces where everyone feels welcome. Each village is unique to the community in which it is located.

Great cities around the world have successfully used pilot or showcase projects to bridge the gap between grand visions and reality. Mayor Murphy and the City Council began the Pilot Village Program to demonstrate how to achieve community supported village development. On its face, the Pilot Village Program involves the selection of sites around the City to demonstrate the City of Villages strategy and how a village can be built. It goes well beyond the notion of contest, however, for the City is committing to partnering with community residents, property owners, agencies and non-profits, and developers to bring these proposals to fruition.

As described in the adopted Pilot Village Program and Application document, the ideal Pilot Village will be located in a highly visible and transit accessible place, and serve as an example that can be replicated throughout San Diego. It will exhibit a style that reflects, respects, and enhances the neighborhood in which it is located. A successful Pilot Village application is based upon creative partnerships and collaborations, and in response to the City Council’s call to action; they must be developed and built within three to five years. Each proposal presents unique challenges and solutions – learning experiences upon which to base community development in a maturing and evolving city. It is a goal that this process will serve as a catalyst toward implementation of the City of Villages strategy around the City, and act as a model of possibility for every community in San Diego.

Process

Timely implementation being paramount, the Planning Department initiated the Pilot Village Program shortly after the City Council adopted the Strategic Framework Element and City of Villages strategy. The selection process officially began on December 2, 2002. On January 16, 2003, the Planning Department held a Pilot Village Open House allowing potential applicants to the program and others to obtain more information, receive assistance with submittal preparation, and ask any additional questions. The Phase One Pilot Village application period closed March 14, 2003. The Planning Department received eight applications by the closing date, and determined seven of the eight applications met the Pilot Village Threshold Criteria.

Technical Working Group

The City Manager established the General Plan Technical Working Group (TWG) in mid 2000 to assist in preparation and implementation of the Strategic Framework Element, Action Plan, and Pilot Village Program. The TWG meets monthly, includes City staff from all disciplines, and has been instrumental in developing different components of the Pilot Village Program including the evaluation program and the incentive package (see Attachment 3, TWG Roster). During the month of April, the TWG spent considerable time evaluating the seven Pilot Village proposals. The TWG repeated the process in a two week time frame in November as they completed a review of the second phase submittals to provide an analysis to the Smart Growth Implementation Committee (SGIC) to meet the public hearing schedule.

Smart Growth Implementation Committee

In June 2001, the Mayor formed the SGIC to assist in removing obstacles to smart growth development in San Diego, and to assist in the implementation of the Strategic Framework Element and City of Villages strategy. The SGIC is co-chaired by Mayor Murphy and Councilmember Atkins. Councilmember Peters also serves on this committee along with civic, education, and business leaders and key City department directors (see Attachment 4, SGIC Roster). The SGIC has provided guidance with respect to the establishment of the Pilot Village Program review process and reviewed and provided comments on the evaluation and selection criteria. The group met on May 14, 2003 to discuss the seven Pilot Village proposals, review staff's analysis, and provide input to the City Manager on a short list. The group reconvened on December 10 to review the second phase submittals and to provide input to the City Manager regarding final selection of the Pilot Villages by the City Council.

Second Phase Submittal

The City Manager announced the short list of the phase one applications on May 21, 2003, based upon the recommendations of the TWG and the SGIC. All seven applications meeting the Threshold and Location Criteria were invited to participate in the second phase of the Pilot Village selection process. Staff and the applicants worked throughout the summer and early fall to ensure that all of the applicants were able to meet the second phase submittal deadline. A number of the applicants held public workshops to solicit community input and provide information regarding their individual proposals. The second phase application period closed on November 3, 2003 and all of the applicants met the deadline. As mentioned above, City staff

and the SGIC provided a review to assist the City Manager with a final recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Related Pilot Village Activities

City staff has also continued to work on companion items to assist implementation of the Pilot Villages after their selection. Based upon the Strategic Framework Citizen Subcommittee recommendation, the Planning Department worked with the development community, TWG, and SGIC to develop a Pilot Village Incentive Package. Planning Commission also had the opportunity to offer comment when the Planning Department presented the draft incentive package as an informational report. The Pilot Village Program Incentives is grouped into five categories: infrastructure, fees and taxes, processing, funding, and policies/regulations. Some of the incentives will give the Pilot Villages priority status to receive existing funds, while others require reprogramming of money. Different Pilot Villages will qualify for different incentives depending upon their location and specific proposals. On November 17, 2003, the City Council adopted the Pilot Village Incentive Program. Adoption of the incentive package is an important component of the partnership between the City and the Pilot Villages and it is a demonstration of the City's commitment to the Pilot Village Program. Additionally, Governmental Relations is working with the TWG to develop a proactive legislative program to secure funding for public facilities in Pilot Villages and the communities in which they are located. City staff will continue to identify resources and funding to assist with Pilot Village development.

DISCUSSION

As mentioned in the previous section, all of the Pilot Village teams worked through the summer and early fall to produce more detailed applications in response to the second phase requirements. The submittals reflect: extensive community outreach, innovative site planning and urban design, sensitivity to community character and needs, partnership building, at least some feasibility analysis, and significant work and enthusiasm. Each of the proposals presents a unique, community based approach to the City of Villages strategy. Although all of the proposals are fine examples of villages, four emerged as premier candidates with respect to their compliance with and responsiveness to the goals of the program, threshold criteria, and design program as specified in the Pilot Village Program application. The evaluation criteria specified in the Pilot Village application is as follows:

Goals

- The pilot village program will act as a model of possibility for every community and a catalyst for the City of Villages strategy as a whole.
- Implementation of the pilot villages will occur through creative partnerships and collaboration.
- As the first of many, the pilot villages will serve as a "classroom experience" on how to implement the village strategy throughout the City.
- Pilot villages will be designed to be an integral part of the fabric of a community.
- At least one pilot village should be linked to the Transit First Showcase project(s)

- Pilot villages will be dispersed geographically throughout the City.
- Initial pilot villages will be developed and built within three to five years.
- The Pilot Village Program will demonstrate how to provide incentives and remove obstacles to village development.

Threshold Criteria

Proposals must meet all of the following criteria to participate in this process:

1. Proposals site must be within one half mile in distance to an existing/planned transit stop.
2. Site must be able to be assembled and entitled within eighteen months. There must also be a viable developing entity with access to financing.
3. There must be general community acceptance and public support for the proposal.
4. The proposal must contain mixed use.
5. The proposal must be located in a village opportunity area on the City of Villages Opportunity Areas Map.
6. The proposal must meet a density minimum as designated on the relevant adopted community plan land use map for the site.

Design Program

1. In addition to housing, the *ideal pilot village* will have a mix of land uses, including (but not limited to):
 - Commercial retail (neighborhood serving)
 - Employment/office
 - Community services (health, social)
 - Entertainment/cultural assets
 - Transit station/stop
 - Public or charter school
 - Public park
 - Public library
 - Community center
 - Public plaza/civic space

The proposal does not necessarily need to provide all of these uses, if the uses already exist adjacent to the project site. Uses located within close proximity of the project will also be considered in the land use mix.

2. The *ideal pilot village* will have interconnected, pedestrian-friendly, narrow streets with a minimum clear width of five feet of sidewalk. It will respect the existing street frontage (if applicable) and represent a unified design theme with respect to street trees, lighting, and street furniture, which is compatible with the neighborhood.
3. The *ideal pilot village* will be located in a highly visible and accessible place where many people will be able to see what a pilot village can look like.
4. The *ideal pilot village* will serve as an example that can be replicated throughout San Diego.
5. Twenty percent or more of the total housing in the *ideal pilot village* will be affordable housing (as defined by the Housing Commission).
6. The *ideal pilot village* will exhibit architectural excellence through a style that reflects, respects, and enhances the neighborhood and community in which it is located, and is of a high caliber. It will fit within the neighborhood with respect to bulk and scale, building mass, and the surrounding structures and streetscape.

Proposal Review

The following section (in alphabetical order) includes: a summary of each proposal, project specifics, highlights, discussion points, feasibility, and the Manager's recommendation. This information is also presented in matrix form in Attachment 2, Pilot Village Threshold Criteria and Program Goals Comparison.

The Boulevard Marketplace (commonly known as MCTIP) – Mid-City (Normal Heights)

Location: This proposal is located along El Cajon Boulevard, and generally south of Meade between 38th Street and 40th Street in the Mid-City neighborhood of Normal Heights.

Applicant: El Cajon Business Improvement Association, Boulevard Development LLC and Clark Realty, LLC.

Summary and Analysis: This proposal is part of the implementation of the Mid-City Transit Interchanges Project, a new approach to addressing the extension of I-15 and community revitalization. Although addressing a small site, eight acres, the applicants have proposed a variety of housing types, 366 units, which results in approximately 50 dwelling units per acre. The proposal also includes neighborhood commercial uses, and a four story class A office space adjacent to the freeway.

This application provides valuable insight into infill development. The site planning and design reflects thoughtful consideration and respect for existing single family uses and the older neighborhood fabric. The proposal is able to balance this consideration with its location immediately adjacent to a major freeway. The Boulevard Marketplace provides

a range of housing types varying from row homes adjacent to the existing single family homes to three and four story apartment units in the center of the project site, and loft over retail uses along busy El Cajon Boulevard. As noted, the office space provides a buffer between the residential uses and the freeway. The applicants also intend to provide 20 percent of the units on site as affordable, a Pilot Village Program goal. The site also includes a pedestrian spine to enhance walkability both within and through the site. Surface parking is available but the vast majority of the parking requirement is provided in an underground parking garage.

The Boulevard Marketplace is also located along the Transit First Demonstration Project which goes from San Diego State University through Mid-City to Balboa Park and Downtown. It is well served by transit, and as already noted, the design is pedestrian friendly and transit accessible.

Feasibility: The development feasibility is good. The project is in a redevelopment area and the community is supportive of the proposal. As noted at the beginning of this section, The Boulevard Marketplace is implementation of MCTIP. MCTIP has been the subject of extensive community outreach and support. Feasibility is impacted by lack of site control, but the proposal has a willing developer and access to financing.

Manager's Recommendation: Select The Boulevard Marketplace as a Pilot Village.

The Edge! – Mira Mesa

Location: This proposal is located between Pacific Heights, Pacific Center, and Pacific Mesa Boulevards near Mira Mesa Boulevard in the Sorrento Mesa area of Mira Mesa.

Applicant: American Assets.

Summary and Analysis: The Edge is an exploration of a City of Villages strategy, the collocation, where appropriate, of residential and employment uses for more efficient land use and to reduce vehicle trips. The proposal retains all of its existing and entitled employment uses, primarily research and development and corporate office, while adding 880 dwelling units and supporting neighborhood commercial uses, community amenities, and civic/public spaces in three 20-24 story buildings. The site design emphasizes the pedestrian in an otherwise auto dominated area. The proposal includes an artwalk to provide connectivity throughout the site and to provide pedestrian access to all of the uses on the site.

The Edge is located far away from existing public facilities and services, and therefore proposes to include an indoor theatre and a community amphitheatre, space for a library annex (either private or a public/private annex) dedicated to science and technology, open space and passive park space. Additionally, the applicant has agreed to fund full improvements to two playing fields, and an existing closed trailhead for Lopez Canyon (the applicant will also maintain the trailhead). Project design also emphasizes green building technologies and passive solar design, and the buildings are not visible from the canyon bottom as is required by the Mira Mesa Community Plan.

The applicant has been before the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group to describe the proposal due to the requirement for a community plan amendment to address the addition of residential uses. The planning group supported the initiation of the amendment for the purpose of studying the issues associated with collocation and the specific impacts associated with the Edge. The applicant is working with a subcommittee on specific project design features and amenities but has not yet submitted a formal application for entitlements. The Mira Mesa Planning Group will consider this item and decide whether or not to conditionally support the Pilot Village at their January 20, 2004 meeting. The application, therefore, is deficient with respect to a statement and evidence of community support (or opposition).

Most importantly, however, is the forecast for transit in this part of the City of San Diego. The draft Regional Transit Vision 2030 Mobility Network (based upon reauthorization of a half cent sales tax) depicts red and yellow line transit (trolley like and express service) to Sorrento Mesa and close to this site, but at an undetermined time in the future. Transit availability is key characteristic that must be present with all of the Pilot Villages. The applicant has discussed the possibility of either a private shuttle to connect with the Mid Coast Line or some sort of public private partnership between Metropolitan Transit Development Board and the major employers in Sorrento Mesa with the community. These options are still in preliminary discussion phases.

Feasibility:

Village feasibility is excellent. The applicant is the owner and developer of the site and has access to financing. The proposal does not require any public subsidy. However, as previously noted, the application does not identify definitive community support at this time and transit availability in the near future. These are both critical requirements of the Pilot Village Program. Additionally, the details of how collocation can be achieved throughout the City is still being discussed at the policy level and support of collocation of this type may be premature.

Manager's Recommendation: Do not select The Edge! as a Pilot Village.

Mi Pueblo – San Ysidro

Location: This proposal is located along the historic commercial core of San Ysidro Boulevard, from I-805 to Cottonwood, the residential neighborhood immediately adjacent, and is linked through Pathways to Knowledge, a system of proposed pedestrian connections throughout the community and to the Las Americas Plaza next to the International Border.

Applicant: Mi Pueblo Partners - Casa Familiar, International Gateway Association, and the San Ysidro Business Association.

Summary and Analysis: This proposal presents an opportunity to revitalize an aging, underutilized neighborhood commercial district while providing a connection to a new community and regional serving shopping plaza and future branch library in the San Ysidro Community. The village will include 1,143 residential dwelling units (the density

range varies between 10-64 dwelling units per acre), 425, 600 square feet of neighborhood, community, and regional commercial uses. The proposal also includes a public market (mercado), social services (Casa Familiar offices), commercial office, public plazas, community gardens, senior housing, linear park, and a proposed 20,000 square foot branch library and a 5,000 square foot community center.

The historic commercial and residential core of San Ysidro is based upon a grid street system. The existing community is walkable and transit is very accessible. Most of the village is within ½ mile of the Beyer Boulevard Trolley Station, and it is less than a mile from the future Intermodal Transit Center anticipated to be completed this spring. Site planning has capitalized upon the existing street grid and improved alleys that function as streets in San Ysidro. The site design emphasizes walkability and connectivity between the old and new neighborhoods throughout the community. Higher density residential and a mix of retail and community serving uses are integrated seamlessly with public and civic space. The design theme builds upon Latino New Urbanism, an urban design philosophy that incorporates many different types of uses, higher density and an accommodation of unit types and site planning for extended family living arrangements.

Feasibility: The feasibility for this proposal is good. Mi Pueblo is located in a redevelopment area, and therefore, can benefit from site consolidation and tax increment financing. The proposal has a willing developer and one of the partners is the San Ysidro Business Improvement District assisted by the Business Improvement District Council. The partnership has also developed an innovative and new equity sharing agreement for the multiple property owners along San Ysidro Boulevard to ensure site control and access to financing. The proposal does require a community plan amendment and rezone to allow for mixed use at a higher density than is currently permitted.

Manager Recommendation: Select Mi Pueblo as a Pilot Village.

Morena Vista – Linda Vista

Location: This proposal is located at the Morena Trolley Station between Napa Street and Linda Vista Road, a major entryway into the community of Linda Vista, on land owned by the Metropolitan Transit Development Board.

Applicant: Linda Vista Civic Association and the Linda Vista Community Planning Group.

Summary and Analysis: Morena Vista is unique among all of the Pilot Village participants, as the applicant pursued project entitlements concurrent with the submittal as a Pilot Village. The City Council granted the final discretionary approvals on November 3, 2003 after many years of community outreach, planning, and extensive site design work.

The proposal incorporates residential and much needed neighborhood retail uses with a transit park-and-ride lot. The parcel is approximately six acres in size and includes 184 units, at an average residential density of 28 dwelling units per acre and 20,416 square

feet of retail use. The site is well-served by the trolley and several bus lines with a frequent level of service. It is located in a highly visible area and has the potential to serve as a catalyst for redevelopment of this portion of the North Bay Redevelopment Area. The proposal enjoys strong community support, including the neighboring University of San Diego.

Although this proposal exhibits many good features and is an admirable project in many ways, it does not meet enough of the goals of the Pilot Village Program to be designated as a Pilot Village. Recognizably, the project faced many challenges in regard to both site constraints and agreements reached prior to the Pilot Village application submittal. Site planning was constrained by the rather small parcel size and the requirement to maintain a valuable trolley parking lot. Morena Vista does not include well integrated public and civic space, and/or a community meeting space as suggested by the Pilot Village Program. Such an amenity could have enhanced the site design. Additionally, slightly less than 10 percent of the residential units will be affordable which is short of the Pilot Village Program goal of providing 20 percent affordable housing on-site. The application also did not provide an adequate explanation of how the proposal addresses universal design or green building technologies.

Feasibility: The development feasibility of this proposal is excellent, as it has received City Council approval and is fully financed. There is a willing developer and the community is supportive of the proposal. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the proposed village will be built in three to five years. Although it is a good example of transit oriented design and will improve a highly visible gateway into the Linda Vista community, it does not include many of the features identified in the Pilot Village Design Program.

Manager's Recommendation: Do not select Morena Vista as a Pilot Village.

North Park Pilot Village

Location: This proposal is located in the heart of North Park in a community business district and emerging arts center along University Avenue between Idaho Street and Bancroft Street.

Applicants: North Park Community Association and North Park Main Street.

Summary and Analysis: The application identifies four individual catalyst projects including the North Park Theatre, Walgreens, North Park Condominiums (224 units), and the 31st Street Mixed Use Project. The village area is approximately 40 acres in size. The proposal also includes a streetscape improvement project that would enhance the pedestrian environment including crossing improvements and traffic calming. Other contributing projects in the application include conducting an historic building inventory, siting a new library, two storefront reconstruction projects, and other smaller improvement projects in new or existing buildings.

The North Park community is supportive of the revitalization of this area as a neighborhood business and arts district. North Park has the advantage of a street grid pattern with street connectivity. This promotes walkability and transit use throughout the proposed village and the surrounding neighborhoods. The transit service is excellent; the village is served by several bus routes, including Route 7, the most heavily used bus route in the City.

With the exception of information provided regarding the North Park Condominiums, the application does not show how site design and project implementation in the balance of the 40-acre village area will incorporate affordable housing, universal design, and green building technologies. The North Park Condominiums will provide ten percent of the units affordable and twenty percent set aside for workforce housing. Additionally, 80 percent of the units will feature universal design, including 36-inch doorways and stepless entrances. The Condominiums also propose to incorporate green building technology.

The application identifies four catalyst projects that are non contiguous (located on four separate blocks) within the proposed 40-acre Pilot Village boundary. Each of the projects would be developed and financed separately. The application did not include a planning proposal or a developing interest for most of the area within the proposed village boundary.

Feasibility:

Project feasibility for this proposal is not as strong as other proposals. It is helpful that the project is in a redevelopment area to assist with land assembly and to provide tax increment financing. Additionally the proposal has good community support. However, given that the applicant does not have site control or indicate plans for site control for any of the properties within the proposed Pilot Village area, it is not possible to meet some of the critical feasibility goals of the Pilot Village Program including the ability to assemble and entitle land within eighteen months and the ability to construct the village within three to five years.

Manager's Recommendation: Do not select the North Park Pilot Village as a pilot village.

The Paseo – College Area

Location: This proposal is located adjacent to the San Diego State University (SDSU) campus along Montezuma Road, Campanile Drive, and on both sides of College Avenue.

Applicant: SDSU Foundation.

Summary and Analysis: This village has the potential to serve both SDSU and the College Area communities. It is approximately 11 acres in size, includes 461 student housing units, which results in a residential density of 46 dwelling units per acre. The proposal provides student housing and region-serving retail and entertainment uses, civic plazas and parks, and classroom uses. The village exhibits an excellent integration of many types of uses, and the site planning was predicated on providing transit access and

enhancing walkability. Additionally, the application provides substantive information regarding the incorporation of universal design features, and intent to utilize green building technologies.

The village site is contiguous to the SDSU trolley station and bus transit center (under construction and anticipated to open in 2005), a major component of the Transit First Demonstration Project. An escalator connection to the subterranean trolley station will provide direct and convenient transit access. This proposal enjoys high visibility and accessibility as a major stop on the Transit First Demonstration Project.

No affordable housing is provided with this proposal per the Housing Commission's definition; however the household characteristics of students are different than typical households that define conventional affordable housing programs. The application provides a proposal to establish a program to set aside 25 percent of the beds for low income students (per criteria to be established by the Housing Commission and Redevelopment Agency) and to provide an additional subsidy to assist with rent payment. The SDSU Foundation is also pursuing the potential of setting aside affordable housing for qualified campus employees. Project financing comes with the requirement that the residential units in this proposal are restricted to students. Subsequently, the SDSU Foundation found it necessary to develop a creative solution to meet both the Pilot Village Program and Redevelopment Agency requirement for affordable housing.

It should be noted, however, that the application requires a community plan amendment and rezone for implementation. On September 26, 2003 the Planning Commission initiated an amendment to the Progress Guide and General Plan, and the College Area Community Plan to reduce the density from 75-110 dwelling units per acre to 45-75 dwelling units per acre.

Feasibility: The development feasibility of this proposal is good. The SDSU Foundation has a majority of the parcels under site control, and the applicants have received financing. Additionally, it is located within a redevelopment area and has access to tax increment funds. The applicants have conducted extensive outreach and their proposal has strong community support. It is reasonable to expect that the majority of the proposed village can be built in three to five years.

Manager's Recommendation: Select The Paseo as a Pilot Village.

Village Center at Euclid and Market – Southeastern San Diego

Location: This proposal is located at the intersection of four neighborhoods in the Southeastern San Diego Community: Chollas View, Lincoln Park, Emerald Hills, and Valencia Park.

Applicant: Euclid and Market Partnership, which consists of the Coalition of Neighborhood Councils, its locally-based member organization, the Euclid-Market Action Team, and the Jacobs Center for Nonprofit Innovation. Reyes Architects is also part of the applicant team.

Summary and Analysis: This proposal demonstrates the concepts of mixed use and transit supporting densities, and builds on the existing Market Creek Plaza development. It is approximately 45 acres in size, proposes 839 units, and has an average residential density of 28 units per acre. The village site design resembles a “hill town”, taking advantage of the topography with terraced residential units allowing for views of Chollas Creek and beyond. The site design responds to and respects Chollas Creek as an urban waterway and an amenity, a linear park for the adjacent residential units and the community. The site plan shows a design based along the east/west axis enhancing the use of solar heat, natural shading/lighting, and energy conservation.

The application proposes to exceed the 20 percent affordable housing goal of the Pilot Village Program on-site, although this will depend on securing affordable housing tax credits and housing bond monies. The proposal also describes the goal to develop as many residential units as possible with open floor plan designs, doorways, materials, and fixtures in accordance with the tenets of universal design.

In addition to residential, land uses with employment, including youth centered employment, job training, neighborhood retail and office, an amphitheatre on the creek, and recreational facilities. The area is also served by the Tubman Chavez Community Center, the Malcolm X Library, the Elementary Institute of Science, and Horton Elementary School.

The village site is well-served by transit (the Euclid trolley station is on the site) and pedestrian connections. Several bus routes also provide service, at fairly high frequency, to many destinations within the City. The existing and proposed land uses will be interconnected through an open space system and a network of trails and pedestrian and bicycle paths. The project is faced with the challenge of traffic volumes along Euclid Avenue and Market Streets and the subsequent impact to walkability.

Feasibility: The development feasibility of this project is good. There is a willing developer, the applicants own most of the land, and the community is supportive of the proposal. Implementation, however, will require a plan amendment and rezone to allow for residential uses. The project is financially feasible, and it is reasonable to expect that most of the proposed village will be built in three to five years.

Manager’s Recommendation: Select the Village Center at Euclid and Market as a Pilot Village.

CONCLUSION

All of the Pilot Village applicants have truly stepped up to the challenge of both the City of Villages strategy and the Pilot Village Program. The applications represent what can be achieved as new partnerships are forged and the community fully participates in development ideas and design. This is, hopefully, the beginning of the Pilot Village Program, and for those selected, the first round of Pilot Villages. It is hoped that many communities have and will continue to benefit from the effort, energy, and good ideas that can evolve from just preparing

and submitting a proposal. We believe that those recommended for selection of Pilot Villages do represent “models of possibility” for every community throughout San Diego, and can serve as a catalyst for implementation of the City of Villages strategy.

Respectfully submitted

S. Gail Goldberg, AICP
Director
Planning Department

Coleen Clementson
Program Manager
Planning Department

GOLDBERG/CLEMENTSON/MCPHERSON/DUVAL/ah

Attachments:

1. Pilot Village Applications provided to Planning Commissioners only.
Applications are available for public review in the Planning Department, City Administration Building, fifth floor.
2. Pilot Village Threshold Criteria and Program Goals Comparison (matrix)
3. Letters of Support
4. Technical Working Group Roster
5. Smart Growth Implementation Committee Roster
6. Potential Pilot Village Locations Map

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO PILOT VILLAGE THRESHOLD CRITERIA AND PROGRAM GOALS
PROPOSAL COMPARISON MATRIX**

GOALS	Mi Pueblo	Morena Vista	North Park	The Boulevard Marketplace (MCTIP)	The Edge!	The Paseo	Village Center at Euclid and Market
TRANSIT Within ½ mile to existing/planned transit	Yes Good existing transit	Yes Good existing transit	Yes Good existing transit	Yes Good existing transit located on Transit First demonstration project	No Significant improvements unlikely in the next 20 years	Yes Good existing transit Located on Transit First demonstration project	Yes Good existing transit
FEASIBILITY Assembled/entitled in 18 months; viable developing entity; built 3-5 years	Good* 3 developers; financially feasible; phasing plan with majority completed in 5 years	Excellent Project approved; will be built in 3-5 years	Fair Applicants do not have site control; most of village will not be built in 3-5 years	Good Willing developer; financially feasible; no site control yet-but in redevelopment area; could occur in 3-5 years	Excellent* Willing developer; financially feasible; developer owns entire site; village will occur in 3-5 years	Good* Willing developer; financially feasible; developer owns most of site; village will occur in 3-5 years	Good* Willing developer; financially feasible; some site acquisition still required; most of village will occur in 3-5 years
PUBLIC SUPPORT Community acceptance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unknown at this time	Yes	Yes
MIXED USE A mix of integrated land uses including residential, commercial, public spaces, and others	Yes Proposes residential, commercial, office, public spaces, library, park, pedestrian “pathway of knowledge”	Yes Proposes residential and commercial; limited civic/public space	Yes Proposes residential and commercial	Yes Proposes residential, commercial, office, and pedestrian path	Yes Proposes residential, commercial, office, plazas, theatre, amphitheatre, fitness facilities, library annex	Yes Proposes residential, commercial, office, theatre, plazas	Yes Proposes residential, commercial, office, amphitheatre, linear park along creek, community center, plazas; youth business park
MAP Must be on COV Opportunity Areas map	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DENSITY MINIMUM As designated on the relevant adopted community plan land use map	Yes Ranges from 10-64 du/ac Community plan density: up to 29 du/ac	Yes 28 du/ac village density Designated community commercial in community plan	No 10 du/ac village density, application includes only 5 projects with residential components Community plan density: 35-75 du/ac	Yes 50 du/ac village density; Community plan density: up to 70 du/ac	Yes 41 du/ac village density Designated for employment use in community plan	No 46 du/ac village density CPA initiated to reduce density to 45-75 du/ac; if approved, village will meet community plan density	Yes 28.3 village density Designated for commercial and industrial in community plan
AFFORDABLE HOUSING Minimum 20% on-site	Yes Exceeds	No <10% affordable proposed	No 10% of North Park Condos project only (not village wide)	Yes 20%, depending on affordable housing subsidies	Yes 20%	Applicant proposing unique approach to affordable housing for students	Yes Exceeds depending on affordable housing subsidies
PARTNERSHIPS Application is a collaborative effort	Yes Mi Pueblo Partnership: Casa Familiar, SYBID, LandGrant Development	Yes Linda Vista Civic Assoc., LV Community Planning Committee	Yes North Park Main Street, NP Community Assoc	Yes El Cajon BIA, Boulevard Development, Clark Realty	No American Assets only applicant	No SDSU Foundation only applicant	Yes Coalition of Neighborhood Councils, Euclid Market Action Team, Jacobs Center, Reyes Architects

*requires plan amendment/rezone

January 15, 2004

Letters of Support

Mi Pueblo

1. San Ysidro Planning and Development Group
2. Business Improvement District Council
3. Border Transportation Council
4. The Enterprise Foundation
5. Hearts and Hands
6. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce
7. San Ysidro Neighborhood Partnership Program
8. San Ysidro School District
9. South County Economic Development Council
10. Washington Mutual

Property Owners

11. Maria Elisa and Antonio Soltero
12. Jose Alanis-Amezcu, MD
13. Elva Terrazas
14. Guillermo Benitez
15. Bertha Gutierrez and Quirino Gutierrez
16. Manuel Gutierrez and Enedina Macias
17. Carlos Vasquez
18. Ricardo Palacios
19. Jesus Monzon and Fred Sobke

Those with an interest in the property

20. Rebecca Hernandez and Rebecca Hernandez Gleghorn
21. Wildrose Real Estate Company, Patricia Rosas
22. Jorge Garciabueno
23. Enrique Rivera

MCTIP Boulevard Marketplace

1. Normal Heights Community Planning Committee
2. Kensington-Talmadge Planning Committee
3. CityLink Investment Corporation
4. Coldwell Banker Commercial
5. Normal Heights Cultural Council
6. Pacific Scene Homes

Morena Vista

1. Linda Vista Community Planning Committee
2. Bayside Community Center
3. CityLink Investment Corporation
4. Linda Vista Civic Association
5. University of San Diego, Office of the President
6. US Bank

North Park

1. Greater North Park Community Planning Committee
2. North Park Main Street
3. North Park Community Association
4. Sierra Club (San Diego Chapter)
5. Walk San Diego
6. Susan Davis, Member of Congress, 49th District
7. Senator Dede Alpert, 39th District

Small businesses

8. A-B Sporting Goods
9. Antique Refinishers
10. Bacchus House
11. The Cabernet
12. Lyric Opera
13. RC Awards
14. San Diego National Bank
15. Stage 7 School of Dance
16. Sumner and Dene Art Gallery
17. Urbanbody North Park

The Edge!

1. Pacific Center

The Paseo

1. College Area Community Council
2. College Community Redevelopment Project Area Committee
3. San Diego State University, Office of the President
4. Jim Madaffer, Council District 7

Village Center at Euclid and Market

1. Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group
2. Coalition of Neighborhood Councils
3. Diamond Business Improvement District

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
GENERAL PLAN TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
ROSTER**

Arts and Culture

Victoria Hamilton
Amy Dukes

City Attorney

Mary Jo Lanza fame

Development Services

Gary Halbert
Kelly Broughton

Economic Development

Ron Smith
Hank Cunningham

Engineering and Capital Projects

Patti Boekamp

Environmental Services

Leah Browder
Linda Pratt

Facilities Financing

Charlene Gabriel
Pam Bernasconi
Marco Camacho

Financial Management

Stacy Blackwood
Lisa Irvine

Planning

Coleen Clementson

Transportation Planning

Linda Marabian

Police/Policy and Planning

Adolfo Gonzales
Kimberly Glenn

Redevelopment

Todd Hooks

Transportation

Mario Sierra
Cruz Gonzalez

Water Department

Leonard Wilson
Larry Gardner

Fire and Life Safety Services

Sam Oates
Tracy Jarman

General Services

Karen Henry
Ernie Anderson

Governmental Relations

Andrew Poat

Housing Commission

Betsy Morris
Cissy Fisher

Library

Meryl Balko
Anna Tatar

MTDB (SANDAG)

Miriam Kirshner

MWWD

Joe Harris
Scott Tulloch
Guann Hwang

Park and Recreation

June Dudas
Mark Marney

**SMART GROWTH IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
MEMBERSHIP ROSTER**

Dick Murphy, Mayor (Co-Chair)
City of San Diego

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director
SANDAG

Toni Atkins, Councilmember (Co-Chair)
City of San Diego Council District 3

Gail Goldberg, Director
City of San Diego Planning Department

Scott Peters, Councilmember
City of San Diego Council District 1

Peter Hall, President
Center City Development Corporation

Alan Bersin, Superintendent
San Diego Unified School District

Tom Larwin
Metropolitan Transit Development Board

Jerry Butkiewicz
San Diego Imperial County Labor Council

Tony Lettieri, Chair
City of San Diego Planning Commission

Tina Christiansen, Director
City of San Diego Development Services

Jack McGrory, Executive Vice President
Price Entities

Donald Cohen, President
Center of Policy Initiatives

Betsy Morris, Director
San Diego Housing Commission

Hank Cunningham, Director
City of San Diego
Economic Development & Community Services

Andrew Poat, Director
City of San Diego Government Relations

Steve Doyle, President
Brookfield Homes San Diego

Stephen Weber, President
San Diego State University

**NOTE: Mr. Weber Recused
From All Discussions on Pilot
Villages.**

Potential Pilot Village Locations

with Draft Regional Transit Vision

